

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

CALVIN ORLANDUS WATKINS,

Plaintiff,

v.

TIPTON COUNTY DEPUTY GREEN,

et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 2:23-cv-02026-SHL-atc

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND DENYING MOTION
FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Annie Christoff’s Order Denying Motion to Introduce Evidence and Report and Recommendation to Deny Motion for Temporary Restraining Order without Prejudice (“R&R”), entered on December 28, 2023, recommending that the Court deny Mr. Calvin Watkins’s pro se Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (ECF No. 10), without prejudice. (ECF No. 12 at PageID 28.)

A magistrate judge may submit to a district court judge proposed findings of fact and recommendations that assist in the determination of certain pretrial matters. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A)–(B). Parties can file objections to the proposed findings and recommendations “[w]ithin 14 days after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A district court reviews de novo only those proposed findings of fact or conclusions of law to which a party specifically objects; the rest are reviewed for clear error. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). “When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee notes.

More than fourteen days have now passed since this R&R was entered on December 28, 2023, (ECF No. 12), and Mr. Watkins has not filed any objections to the R&R. Since no objections have been filed, the Court reviews the R&R in its entirety for clear error and finds none.

The R&R describes the high bar that is required for temporary restraining orders under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b). (Id. at PageID 27.) Mr. Watkins's motion falls short of the threshold requirements of Rule 65(b) because it fails to mention the type of injunctive relief sought and does not identify facts that demonstrate the immediate and irreparable injury that he would suffer absent injunctive relief. (Id.) Therefore, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's R&R and **DENIES** Mr. Watkins's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 24th day of January, 2024.

s/ Sheryl H. Lipman
SHERYL H. LIPMAN
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE